

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 10 has been amended as shown on page 3 of the Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 10-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 10 has been amended to address any deficiencies related to this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, 14 and 16-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, 14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen-Levy *et al.* (US 5,423,034) in view of Nelson (US 2004/0122849 A1). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cohen-Levy *et al.* in view of Nelson fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

The subject invention relates to controlling access to computer objects based on the computer space from which access will occur. For example, access rights to a computer file can be based on user and location, such as only Users A and B are allowed access to the computer file, but only from Networks X and Y. If User C tried to access the computer file, access would be denied and if User A tried to access the computer file from Network Z, access would be denied. In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claim 10) recites *one or more access control fields rendered together and indicating plural selectable computer spaces for the computer object, at least one of the computer spaces is a computer where one or more users is located during access to the computer object and at least one of the computer spaces corresponding to access to the computer object for the one or more computer users.*

Cohen-Levy *et al.* and Nelson do not teach or suggest the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims. Cohen-Levy *et al.* discloses a system for managing network files where access privileges are defined at the file level and every level of the directory structure. The Office Action concedes that the cited art fails to teach access control fields that control access to computer object from computer spaces where at least one of the computer spaces is a computer where one or more users is located during access to the computer object. However, contrary to assertions in the Office Action, Nelson also does not teach this novel feature of the subject claims. The prior art reference discloses a system for partitioning a single database into domains. A domain is a means to tag a group of users and database objects with a common identifier. The system will tag each database object with a domain identifier. Only users that are also tagged with the same domain identifier can access the database object. This is merely a means for providing group access control to files or directories. A domain does not provide any information indicating where the user is located when they are attempting to access the file or directory. For example, if a company wanted to restrict a user so that they could only access a file from location 123, the domain control of Nelson does not provide this level of access control. If the user was attempting to access the file from location ABC, the system of the cited art would only verify that the user was tagged with the correct domain identifier without any consideration of where they are located. If the user is tagged with the correct domain identifier, then the system would allow them to access the document while they are at location ABC. Therefore, Cohen-Levy *et al.* and Nelson, alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest one or more access control fields rendered together and indicating plural

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

selectable computer spaces for the computer object, at least one of the computer spaces is *a computer where one or more users is located during access to the computer object* and at least one of the computer spaces corresponding to *access to the computer object for the one or more computer users*.

In view of at least the above, it is respectfully submitted that Cohen-Levy *et al.* in view of Nelson does not teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 10 (and claims 2, 5, 7-9, 11, 14 and 16-18 which respectively depend therefrom) and thus fails to make obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen-Levy *et al.* in view of Nelson and Cohen *et al.* (US 6,507,845 B1). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cohen-Levy *et al.* in view of Nelson and Cohen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

The subject claims depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As noted *supra*, Cohen-Levy *et al.* and Nelson do not teach or suggest each and every element of the subject invention as recited in these independent claims, and Cohen *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Cohen-Levy *et al.* and Nelson. Cohen, *et al.* teaches a system for managing collaboration amongst a group of users involved in a task. As conceded in the Office Action dated August 22, 2005, Cohen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest controlling access to the computer object from a computer location. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Cohen-Levy *et al.*, Nelson and Cohen *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 10 (and claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 which respectively depend therefrom). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

10/609,104

MS303082.01/MSFTP688US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP688US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731